arXiv:1610.04400v1 [math.MG] 14 Oct 2016

Pairwise intersecting homothets of a convex body

A. Polyanskii*

October 17, 2016

Abstract

We show that the maximum number of pairwise intersecting homothets of a d-dimensional centrally symmetric convex body, none of which contains the center of another in its interior, is at most 3^{d+1}. Also, we improve upper bounds for cardinalities of k-distance sets in Minkowski spaces.

1 Introduction

A convex body K in the d-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$ is a compact convex set with non-empty interior, and is o-symmetric if $K = -K$. A homothet of K is a set of the form $\mathbf{v} + \lambda K := \{\mathbf{v} + \lambda\mathbf{k} : \mathbf{k} \in K\}$, where $\lambda > 0$ is the homothety ratio, and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a translation vector. Also, we write ∂K for the boundary of a convex body K, $[n]$ for the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, $dist(h_1, h_2)$ for the distance between two parallel hyperplanes h_1 and h_2.

A Minkowski arrangement of an o-symmetric convex body K is called a family $\{\mathbf{v}_i + \lambda_i K\}$ of homothets of K such that none of the homothets contains the center of any other homothet in its interior (see [7]). We write $\kappa(K)$ for the largest number of homothets that a pairwise intersecting Minkowski arrangement of K can have. Furedi and Loeb [2] proved that $\kappa(K) \leq 5^d$. Recently, Naszodi, Pach and Swanepoel [4] improved this result $\kappa(K) \leq O(3^d d \log d)$. The authors of [4] noted it is obvious that for the d-dimensional cube C^d we have $\kappa(C^d) = 3^d$. We prove the following upper bound for $\kappa(K)$, which is sharp up to the constant factor.

Theorem 1. *For any d-dimensional o-symmetric convex body K,*

$$\kappa(K) \leq 3^{d+1}.$$

Also, some generalization of a Minkowski arrangement for non-symmetric bodies (the role of a center is played by arbitrary interior point) was studied in [4]. Unfortunately, it is impossible to generalize our approach for non-symmetric bodies.

Following [8], we call a subset S of a metric space a *k-distance set* if there are k non-zero distances occurring between points of S. A 1-distance set is called an *equilateral set*. For d-dimensional Minkowski spaces it is well known that the maximal cardinality of an equilateral set is 2^d with equality iff the unit ball of the space is a parallelotope, see [6]. Swanepoel [8] proved that if the unit ball of a d-dimensional Minkowski space is a parallelotope then a k-distance set has cardinality

*Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Technion, Institute for Information Transmission Problems RAS. e-mail: alexander.polyanskii@yandex.ru. The author was partially supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, grants №15-31-20403 (mol_a_ved), №15-01-99563 A, №15-01-03530 A.

at most $(k+1)^d$, where the bound is tight. Therefore, he [8] conjectured that the maximal cardinality of k-distance sets in Minkowski spaces is $(k+1)^d$. Also, it was proved in [8] that the cardinality of a k-distance set in a d-dimensional Minkowski space is at most $\min\{2^{kd}, (k+1)^{(11^d-9^d)/2}\}$. Moreover, the last bound was recently replaced by k^{5^d}, see [9]. Our second result is the following improvement.

Theorem 2. *The cardinality of a k-distance set ($k > 1$) in a d-dimensional Minkowski space is at most $k^{O(3^d d)}$.*

Our proof is based on the following theorem, which seems to be of independent interest.

Theorem 3. *Suppose that points $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \dots, \mathbf{v}_n$ are such points in the d-dimensional Minkowski space with a o-symmetric body K as the unit ball that $\|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_j\|_K = \lambda_i$ for any $1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n$, where λ_i, $i \in [n]$, are some positive numbers. Then*

$$n \leq d\left(1 + \frac{2}{2 - 2^{-(d-1)}}\right)^{d+1} = O(3^d d).$$

For more links dealing with k-distance sets we refer reader to [8, 9]

One of the main ingredients of proofs of Theorems 1 and 3 is the following simple lemma which is a generalization of the well-known Danzer-Grunbaum theorem about the maximal cardinality antipodal sets, i.e. such sets that satisfy conditions of Lemma 1 when $\lambda = 1$ (see [1] and also Lemma 13 in [4]).

Lemma 1. *Suppose that $X = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is such set of points that for any $i \neq j \in [n]$ there are two parallel different hyperplanes $k_{i,j}$ and $k_{j,i}$ that $X \subset conv(k_{i,j}, k_{j,i})$*

$$\frac{dist(k_{i,j}, k_{j,i})}{dist(g_{i,j}, g_{j,i})} \leq \lambda, \tag{1}$$

where $g_{i,j}$ and $g_{j,i}$ are hyperplanes passing through $\mathbf{x}_i$ and $\mathbf{x}_j$ and parallel to $k_{i,j}$. Then $n \leq (1+\lambda)^d$.

The article is organized in the following way. In Section 2.1 we prove Lemma 1. In Section 2.2 we discuss some properties of a set of pairwise intersecting homothets, which we will use in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 where we present the proofs of Theorem 1 and Theorem 3 respectively. In Section 3.3 we prove Theorem 2 using Theorem 3.

Acknowledgment. We wish to thank Marton Naszodi and Konrad Swanepoel for stimulating and fruitfull discussions.

2 Auxiliary Lemmas

2.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Assume that $P = conv(X)$ is such a polytope that $aff(P) = \mathbb{R}^d$, otherwise $d_1 = dim(aff(P)) < d$, i.e. by induction hypothesis we have $n \leq (1+\lambda)^{d_1} < (1+\lambda)^d$. It is easy to see that $P_i = \mathbf{x}_i + \frac{1}{1+\lambda}(P - \mathbf{x}_i) \subset P$. Without loss of generality we assume that $\mathbf{x}_i$ is closer to $k_{i,j}$ then $\mathbf{x}_j$. We claim that P_i and P_j do not share a common interior point. Indeed, $P_i \subset conv(k_{i,j} \cup l_{i,j})$, $P_j \subset conv(k_{j,i} \cup l_{j,i})$, where $l_{i,j} = \mathbf{x}_i + \frac{1}{1+\lambda}(k_{j,i} - \mathbf{x}_i)$, $l_{j,i} = \mathbf{x}_j + \frac{1}{1+\lambda}(k_{i,j} - \mathbf{x}_j)$. Note that $conv(k_{i,j} \cup l_{i,j})$ and

$conv(k_{j,i} \cup l_{j,i})$ do not have a common interior point because

$$dist(k_{i,j}, l_{i,j}) + dist(k_{j,i}, l_{j,i}) =$$
$$= dist(k_{i,j}, g_{i,j}) + \frac{1}{1+\lambda} dist(g_{i,j}, k_{j,i}) + dist(k_{j,i}, g_{j,i}) + \frac{1}{1+\lambda} dist(g_{j,i}, k_{i,j}) =$$
$$= dist(k_{i,j}, k_{j,i}) - dist(g_{i,j}, g_{j,i}) + \frac{1}{1+\lambda} dist(k_{i,j}, k_{j,i}) + \frac{1}{1+\lambda} dist(g_{i,j}, g_{j,i}) \leq dist(k_{i,j}, k_{j,i}).$$

The last inequality holds because of (1). Therefore, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} vol(P_i) \leq vol(P)$, i.e. $\frac{n}{(1+\lambda)^d} vol(P) \leq vol(P)$, $n \leq (1+\lambda)^d$. Lemma 1 is proved.

2.2 Properties of pairwise intersecting homothets

Throughout Section 2.2, $\ell(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ denotes the line passing through points $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$, $\ell(\mathbf{x}, l)$ and $h(\mathbf{x}, h)$ stand for the line and the plane passing through a point $\mathbf{x}$ and parallel to a line l and to a plane h respectively, we write $[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]$ for the segment with endpoints $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$, $\Delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ denotes the triangle with vertices $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}$.

Let us identify $\mathbb{R}^d$ with the plane

$$h = \{(x_1, \dots, x_{d+2}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+2} : x_{d+1} = 0, x_{d+2} = 1\} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^{d+2}$$

and consider the following hyperplanes

$$h_0 = \{(x_1, \dots, x_{d+2}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+2} : x_{d+2} = 1\} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^{d+2},$$
$$h_1 = \{(x_1, \dots, x_{d+2}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+2} : x_{d+1} = 1\} \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^{d+2}.$$

Note that $h \subset h_0$. Let $\{\mathbf{e}_i : i \in [d+2]\}$ be the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^{d+2}$.

Suppose that $\{\mathbf{v}_i + \lambda_i K : i \in [n]\} \subset h$ is a finite set of pairwise intersecting homothets of K.

Section 2.2 is organized in the following way. First, we define the set $X_0 := \{\mathbf{x}_i := \mathbf{v}_i + \lambda_i \mathbf{e}_{d+1} : i \in [n]\} \subset h_0$ of n points and prove some properties of X_0. Second, we apply the central projection $pr : h_0 \to h_1$ from the origin onto the hyperplane h_1 to X_0. Finally, we check that the image $X_1 := \{\mathbf{y}_i := pr(\mathbf{x}_i) : i \in [n]\} \subset h_1$ of X_0 satisfies some properties. Note that ideas that we use in the present section are inspired by works [5, 3].

Choose $i \neq j \in [n]$. Write $r := r_{i,j} := \ell(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j) \subset h$ and let $\mathbf{r} := \mathbf{r}_{i,j}$ and $-\mathbf{r}$ be points of intersection ∂K and $\ell(\mathbf{o}, r)$, here we suppose that vectors $\mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i$ have the same direction. Denote by $f := f_{i,j}$ a supporting hyperplane of $\mathbf{v}_i + \lambda_i K$ in h passing through $\mathbf{v}_i + \lambda_i \mathbf{r}$, i.e. f is a $(d-1)$-dimensional plane.

Assume that $\mathbf{v}'_k := \mathbf{v}'_{k,i,j}$, $\mathbf{x}'_k := \mathbf{x}'_{k,i,j}$ and $t_k := t_{k,i,j} = [\mathbf{v}'_k - \lambda_k \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}'_k + \lambda_k \mathbf{r}] \subset r$ are projections of $\mathbf{v}_k$, $\mathbf{x}_k$ and $\mathbf{v}_k + \lambda_k K$ to direction f onto the two-dimensional plane π, where $\pi := \pi_{i,j}$ passes through $\mathbf{v}_i$, $\mathbf{v}_j$, $\mathbf{x}_i$ and $\mathbf{x}_j$. It follows immediately that $\mathbf{x}'_k = \mathbf{v}'_k + \lambda_k \mathbf{e}_{d+1}$, $t_i = [\mathbf{v}_i - \lambda_i \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}_i + \lambda_i \mathbf{r}]$ and $t_j = [\mathbf{v}_j - \lambda_j \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}_j + \lambda_j \mathbf{r}]$.

We claim that segments t_k share a common point $\mathbf{x} := \mathbf{x}_{i,j}$. Indeed, any two segments t_p and t_q share a common point otherwise K_p and K_q do not intersect each other. Therefore, by Helly's theorem for $\mathbb{R}$ we have that t_k have a common point $\mathbf{x}$.

Let $u_i := u_{i,j}$ and $u_j := u_{j,i}$ be such numbers that $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v}_i = u_i \mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{x} = u_j \mathbf{r}$. Set

$$a := a_{i,j} := \ell(\mathbf{v}_i + \lambda_i \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x}_i),\ b := b_{i,j} := \ell(\mathbf{v}_j - \lambda_j \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x}_j),$$
$$a_0 := a_{0,i,j} := \ell(\mathbf{x}, a),\ b_0 := b_{0,i,j} := \ell(\mathbf{x}, b),$$
$$f_0 := f_{0,i,j} := h(\mathbf{x}, f),\ A_0 := A_{0,i,j} := aff(a_0 \cup f_0),\ B_0 := B_{0,i,j} := aff(b_0 \cup f_0).$$

Note that the set X_0 lies in the wedge formed by A_0 and B_0 in h_0 that doesn't contain h. Indeed, points $\mathbf{x}'_k$ lie in the angle formed by a_0 and b_0 that doesn't contain line r. Because $\mathbf{x}'_k$ are projections of $\mathbf{x}_k$ onto to direction f the plane π therefore points $\mathbf{x}_k$ lie in the corresponding wedge formed by A_0 and B_0.



Next, we apply the central projection $pr : h_0 \to h_1$ from the origin onto the hyperplane h_1. The image of h is the "hyperplane at infinity" in h_1. Therefore, we get the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *$A_1 := A_{1,i,j} = pr(A_0)$ and $B_1 := B_{1,i,j} = pr(B_0)$ are parallel hyperplanes in h_1 and $X_1 = pr(X_0)$ lies in the slab $conv(A_1 \cup B_1)$.*

Denote by $\mathbf{z}_i := \mathbf{z}_{i,j}$ and $\mathbf{z}_j = \mathbf{z}_{j,i}$ points of intersection $r_0 := r_{0,i,j} = \ell(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$ with a_0 and b_0 respectively. As we defined before $\mathbf{y}_k = pr(\mathbf{x}_k)$. Let $\mathbf{t}_i := \mathbf{t}_{i,j} = pr(\mathbf{z}_i)$, $\mathbf{t}_j := \mathbf{t}_{j,i} = pr(\mathbf{z}_j)$. Of course, $\mathbf{t}_i$ and $\mathbf{t}_j$ are points of intersection of line $\ell(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}_j)$ with A_1 and B_1 respectively because central projections preserve lines. Denote by $g_{i,j}$ and $g_{j,i}$ hyperplanes in h_1 that are parallel to A_1 and B_1 and pass through $\mathbf{y}_i$ and $\mathbf{y}_j$ respectively.

Lemma 3. *We have*

$$\frac{dist(A_1, B_1)}{dist(g_{i,j}, g_{j,i})} = \frac{\|\mathbf{t}_i - \mathbf{t}_j\|}{\|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_j\|} = \frac{2\lambda_i\lambda_j}{\lambda_i u_j + \lambda_j u_i}.$$

Proof. Denote by $\mathbf{c}$ the point of intersection r_0 with r, probably that $\mathbf{c}$ is a "point at infinity". Without loss of generality we assume that points on the line r_0 lie in the following order: $\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{z}_j$. Denote by $\mathbf{w}_i$ and $\mathbf{w}_j$ orthogonal projections of $\mathbf{z}_i$ and $\mathbf{z}_j$ onto line r respectively. Note that points on the line r lie in the following order: $\mathbf{w}_i$, $\mathbf{v}_i$, $\mathbf{x}$, $\mathbf{v}_j$, $\mathbf{w}_j$. Moreover, $\mathbf{x}$ must lie between $\mathbf{v}_j - \lambda_j\mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{v}_i + \lambda_i\mathbf{r}$.



We see at once that triangles $\Delta(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{x}_i)$ and $\Delta(\mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{x}_j)$ are homothetic with center $\mathbf{c}$. Also, triangles $\Delta(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}_i)$ and $\Delta(\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_i + \lambda_i \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{x}_i)$ are homothetic with center $\mathbf{c}$. Using these facts we get

$$\|\mathbf{z}_i - \mathbf{w}_i\| = \frac{\lambda_i u_j + \lambda_j u_i}{u_i + u_j + \lambda_j - \lambda_i}, \quad \frac{\|\mathbf{z}_i - \mathbf{x}_i\|}{\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|} = \frac{\|\mathbf{w}_i - \mathbf{v}_i\|}{\|\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_j\|} = \frac{\lambda_i - u_i}{u_i + u_j + \lambda_j - \lambda_i}.$$



Also, we have

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{z}_i\|}{\|\mathbf{t}_i\|} = \|\mathbf{z}_i - \mathbf{w}_i\| = \frac{\lambda_i u_j + \lambda_j u_i}{u_i + u_j + \lambda_j - \lambda_i}, \quad \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_j\|}{\|\mathbf{y}_j\|} = \lambda_j.$$

Let $r_1 = \ell(\mathbf{t}_i, r_0)$ and $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{q}$ be points of intersection the line r_1 with $\ell(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{x}_i)$ and $\ell(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{x}_j)$ respectively. Because r_0 and r_1 are parallel lines, therefore,

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{q}\|}{\|\mathbf{y}_j\|} = \frac{\lambda_j}{\|\mathbf{z}_i - \mathbf{w}_i\|}, \quad \frac{\|\mathbf{t}_i - \mathbf{p}\|}{\|\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\|} = \frac{\|\mathbf{z}_i - \mathbf{x}_i\|}{\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j\|} = \frac{\lambda_i - u_i}{u_i + u_j + \lambda_j - \lambda_i}.$$

Applying Menelaus' theorem for $\Delta(\mathbf{t}_i, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{y}_j)$ and line $\ell(\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{x}_i)$ we get

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{t}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\|}{\|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_j\|} = \frac{\lambda_i \lambda_j - u_i \lambda_j}{\lambda_i u_j + \lambda_j u_i}.$$

Analogously,

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{y}_j - \mathbf{t}_j\|}{\|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_j\|} = \frac{\lambda_j\lambda_i - u_j\lambda_j}{\lambda_j u_i + \lambda_i u_j},$$

i.e. therefore,

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{t}_i - \mathbf{t}_j\|}{\|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_j\|} = \frac{2\lambda_i\lambda_j}{\lambda_i u_j + \lambda_i u_j}.$$

□

Lemma 4. *If $t_i \cap t_j \subset [\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j]$ then*

$$\frac{2\lambda_i\lambda_j}{\lambda_i u_j + \lambda_j u_i} \leq 2.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality we assume that $\lambda_i \geq \lambda_j$. Note that by definition u_i, u_j are such numbers that $\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{v}_i = u_i\mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{x} = u_j\mathbf{r}$. Thus if $x \in t_i \cap t_j \subset [\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j]$ then $u_i, u_j \geq 0$ and $u_i + u_j \geq \lambda_i \geq \lambda_j$, i.e. $\lambda_i\lambda_j \leq (u_i+u_j)\lambda_j \leq (\lambda_j u_i + \lambda_i u_j)$. The last inequality proves the statement of Lemma 4. □

3 Proofs of theorems

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Using notations of Section 2.2, we consider $X_1 \subset h_1$, where h_1 is a $(d+1)$-dimensional plane. Moreover, by Lemmas 2 and 3 for any $i \neq j \in [n]$ there exist two parallel d-dimensional planes A_1 and B_1 such that $\mathbf{y}_k \in conv(A_1 \cup B_1)$ for any $k \in [n]$ and

$$\frac{dist(A_1, B_1)}{dist(g_{i,j}, g_{j,i})} = \frac{2\lambda_i\lambda_j}{\lambda_i u_j + \lambda_j u_i}. \tag{2}$$

Because homothets form a Minkowski arrangement thus $t_i \cap t_j \subset [\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j]$, i.e. by Lemma 4 we have that (2) is less or equal to 2. Therefore, X_1 satisfies conditions of Lemma 1 with $\lambda = 2$. Thus $n \leq 3^{d+1}$.

3.2 Proof of Theorems 3

Consider the following family of pairwise intersecting homothets $\{\mathbf{v}_i + \lambda_i K : i \in [n]\}$, here we suppose that $\lambda_n := \lambda_{n-1}$. Without loss of generality assume that $\max_{i\in[n]} \lambda_i = 1$. Let us divide the set $[n]$ into d subsets. For any $l \in [d]$ we consider

$$J_l = \{i \in [n] : \lambda_i \in \mu^{l-1}I\}, \text{ where } \mu = 2^{-1/(d-1)} < 1, \text{ i.e. } \mu^d = \mu/2, \text{ and}$$

$$I = I_1 \cup I_2 \cup I_3 \cup \cdots := (\mu, 1] \cup (\mu^{d+1}, \mu^d] \cup (\mu^{2d+1}, \mu^{2d}] \cup \dots$$

Obviously, J_l are not pairwise intersecting sets and their union is $[n]$. We claim that

$$|J_l| \leq \left(1 + \frac{2}{2-\mu}\right)^{d+1} \tag{3}$$

Obviously, (3) implies the statement of Theorem 3

$$n \leq d\left(1 + \frac{2}{2-\mu}\right)^{d+1}.$$

It is enough to prove (3) for $l = 1$. Consider a set of homothets $\{\mathbf{v}_k + \lambda_k K : k \in J_1\}$. Using notations of Section 2.2 we have that for any $i \neq j$ there exist two parallel d-dimensional planes A_1 and B_1 in the $(d+1)$-dimensional plane h_1 such that $y_k \in conv(A_1 \cup B_1)$ for any $k \in J_1$ and

$$\frac{dist(A_1, B_1)}{dist(g_{i,j}, g_{j,i})} = \frac{2\lambda_i\lambda_j}{\lambda_i u_j + \lambda_j u_i} \tag{4}$$

Because of Lemma 1 it is enough to prove that fraction (4) is at most $\frac{2}{2-\mu} > 2$. Consider two cases:

1) $i, j \in I_k$ for some k. Assume that $i < j$ thus $\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i = \lambda_i \mathbf{r}$. If $\lambda_i \geq \lambda_j$ then we have $t_i \cap t_j \subset [\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j]$, i.e. by Lemma 4 we have that (4) is at most 2. Suppose that $\lambda_j > \lambda_i$ thus because $\mathbf{x} \in [\mathbf{v}_j - \lambda_j \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}_i + \lambda_i \mathbf{r}] = [\mathbf{v}_j - \lambda_j \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{v}_j]$ then $u_i + u_j = \lambda_i$, $0 \leq u_j \leq \lambda_j$. Therefore, using $\lambda_j/\lambda_i > \mu$ (because $i, j \in I_k$) we have

$$\frac{\lambda_i u_j + \lambda_j u_i}{\lambda_i \lambda_j} = u_j \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_j} - \frac{1}{\lambda_i}\right) + \frac{u_i + u_j}{\lambda_i} \geqslant \lambda_j \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_j} - \frac{1}{\lambda_i}\right) + 1 > 2 - \mu,$$

i.e. (4) is at most $\frac{2}{2-\mu}$.

2) $i \in I_k, j \in I_l$ for some $k < l$. Note that $\lambda_i > 2\lambda_j$ (see the definition of I_m) thus it is impossible that $\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i = \lambda_j \mathbf{r}$. Indeed, in such case $\mathbf{v}_i + \lambda_i \partial K$ and $\mathbf{v}_j + \lambda_j \partial K$ do not intersect each other because of triangle inequality but they should. Therefore, $\mathbf{v}_j - \mathbf{v}_i = \lambda_i \mathbf{r}$, i.e. $t_i \cap t_j \subset [\mathbf{v}_i, \mathbf{v}_j]$, thus (4) is at most 2.

Theorem 3 is proved.

3.3 Proof of Theorem 2

Assume that there exists a k-distance set $\{\mathbf{x}_i : i \in [n]\}$ in the d-dimensional Minkowski space with a o-symmetric body K as the unit ball, where

$$n = k^{f(d)}, \ f(d) = \left\lfloor d \left(1 + \frac{2}{2 - 2^{-(d-1)}}\right)^{d+1} \right\rfloor = O(3^d d).$$

We will construct a set $Y = \{\mathbf{y}_i : i \in [f(d)+1]\}$ in the same d-dimensional Minkowski space such that $\|\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{y}_j\|_K = \lambda_i$ for any $1 \leq i < j \leq f(d) + 1$, where λ_i are some positive numbers, using the following algorithm.

0. Set $A := [n]$, $Y := \{\mathbf{y}_1 := \mathbf{x}_1\}$, $l := 1$.
1. Let λ_l be such a positive number that the cardinality of the set

$$A' := \{j : \|\mathbf{y}_l - \mathbf{x}_j\}\|_K = \lambda_l, j \in A\}$$

   is at least $k^{f(d)-l}$ (such i_l exists because $|A| \geq k^{f(d)-l+1}$ and there are k distances occurring between points of $\{\mathbf{x}_i : i \in A \subset [n]\}$). Put $A := A'$.
2. Choose any $j \in A$ and put $\mathbf{y}_{l+1} := \mathbf{x}_j$. Add $\mathbf{y}_{l+1}$ to the set Y.
3. If $l < f(d)$ then $l := l + 1$ and return to Step 1, else, output Y, and finish.

Obviously, the existence of the set Y contradicts Theorem 3, therefore, we get a contradiction with our assumption that there exists a k-distance set consisting of $k^{f(d)}$ points in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

References

[1] L. Danzer, B. Grnbaum, *Uber zwei Probleme bezglich konvexer Korper von P. Erdos und von V. L. Klee*, Math. Z. **79** (1962), 95–99.

[2] Z. Furedi and P. A. Loeb, *On the best constant for the Besicovitch covering theorem*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **121**(4) (1994), 1063–1073.

[3] Zs. Langi, M. Naszodi, *On the Bezdek-Pach conjecture for centrally symmetric convex bodies*, Canad. Math. Bull. **52**(3) (2009), 407–415.

[4] M. Naszodi, J. Pach, K. Swanepoel, *Arrangements of homothets of a convex body*, arXiv:1608.04639, submitted.

[5] M. Naszodi, *On a conjecture of Karoly Bezdek and Janos Pach*, Period. Math. Hungar. **53**(1-2) (2006), 227–230.

[6] M. Petty, *Equilateral sets in Minkowski spaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **29** (1971), 369–374.

[7] L. F. Toth, *Research problem*, Period. Math. Hungar. **31**(2) (1995), 165–166.

[8] K. Swanepoel, *Cardinalities of k-distance sets in Minkowski spaces*, Discrete Mathematics **197/198** (1999), 759–767.

[9] K. Swanepoel, *Combinatorial distance geometry in normed spaces*, survey. In preparation.